

biasing members (72 and 74), a switch contacting portion (66), and a pivot (68). The switch is adapted to open the light circuit when the doors are closed, and close the lamp circuits when the doors are opened. Notably, the door switch is not adapted to fade-out or is it a non-processor light fade-out circuit. Additionally, the switch does not control lights mounted externally.

Claim 1 recites “a refrigerator comprising a fresh food section and a freezer section, at least one of said fresh food section and freezer section comprising a door comprising an external surface and an internal surface, and a light mounted to said external surface, said light electrically coupled to a processor-free light fade-out circuit.”

Prada does not describe or suggest a light mounted to an external surface as recited by Claim 1. More particularly, Prada does not describe or suggest a refrigerator including a fresh food section and a freezer section, wherein the at least one of fresh food section and freezer section include a door that includes an external surface and an internal surface, and a light mounted to the external surface, and wherein the light is electrically coupled to a processor-free light fade-out circuit. Rather, Prada describes a refrigerator door switch operable by either one or both of two adjacent doors of a two-door refrigerator-freezer to control internal lights. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 14 is patentable over Prada.

Claim 2-7 depend from Claim 1, and when the recitations of Claims 2-7 are considered with the recitations of Claim 1, Claims 2-7 are likewise submitted to be patentable over Prada.

Claim 14 recites “a method for de-energizing an appliance light, said method comprising providing a light bulb...providing a processor-free light fade-out circuit...and electrically coupling the light bulb to the processor-free light fade-out circuit such that the appliance light is de-energized using the processor-free light fade-out circuit.”

Prada does not describe or suggest a processor-free light fade-out circuit as recited by Claim 14. More particularly, Prada do not describe or suggest a method for de-energizing an appliance light, wherein the method includes providing a light bulb, providing a processor-free light fade-out circuit, and electrically coupling the light bulb to the processor-free light fade-out circuit such that the appliance light is de-energized using the processor-free light fade-out circuit. Rather, Prada describe a switch that is adapted to open a light circuit when

the doors are closed, and close the lamp circuits when the doors are opened. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 14 is patentable over Prada.

Claim 15-20 depend from Claim 14, and when the recitations of Claims 15-20 are considered with the recitations of Claim 14, Claims 15-20 are likewise submitted to be patentable over Prada.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1, 14, and 20 be withdrawn.

The objection to Claims 2-7 and 15-19 is respectfully traversed. Claims 2-7 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 2-7 depend from independent Claim 1 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 2-7 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-7 likewise are in condition for allowance.

Claims 15-19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 15-19 depend from independent Claim 14 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 15-19 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 14, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 15-19 likewise are in condition for allowance.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants request that the objection to Claims 2-7 and 15-19 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Thomas M. Fisher
Registration No. 47,564
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070